



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

emphasis that we naturally represent it by the pronoun 'it', why did not Livy use *eius*?

Again, Cicero (De Imp. Pomp. 16), says, Nisi eos qui vobis fructui sunt conservarit non solum, ut ante dixi, calamitate, sed etiam calamitatis formidine liberatos. Professor Greene thinks it is "inconceivable that an orator in any language would emphasize like this: not only from *disaster*, but also from the dread of *DISASTER*". How about 'not only from *disaster*, but also from the dread of *disaster*', which is the emphasis suggested by the Greenough theory? This emphasizes not so much the meaning of the word *calamitatis* as the relation involved in its case. Cicero had shortly before said, Itaque haec vobis provincia . . . non modo a calamitate, sed etiam a metu calamitatis est defendenda. Can we suppose that anything in the studied utterances of so consummate a master of rhetoric was without a purpose, and is not such a subtle nuance quite worthy of him?

Also in the case from the Laelius (82), Nam maximum ornamentum amicitiae tollit, qui ex ea tollit verecundiam, I "hold the opposite view", even at the risk of its being "as absurd as it would be for a player to deliver Hamlet's line thus—'If thou wilt needs marry, MARRY a fool'". Parallels between English and Latin are ticklish things, and I venture to think that, far from its being "clear that the first *tollit* is more emphatic than the second", there is no relation of emphasis between them. As to the emphasis claimed for *verecundiam*, I would remark that the previous sentence is, Neque solum colent inter se ac diligent, sed etiam verebuntur, in which Professor Greene presumably makes *verebuntur* emphatic as a climactic word. Is *verecundiam*, then, a case of that flat and wellnigh "inconceivable" repetition of an emphasis so castigated in *calamitatisque formidine*? I hold, of course, that the first sentence has no relations of emphasis "within the meaning of the law" (except between *colent* and *inter se*), and that the second sentence means 'For he takes from friendship its VERY GREATEST *adornment* who leaves reverence out of it'.

I have selected these examples because they seem to me the most slippery and likely to give the most trouble to the inexperienced student. It would require too much space and weary the reader over much to analyse all of Professor Greene's examples. I will therefore close with a brief treatment of one more in which there seems to me a logical reason in the situation itself for an emphasis different from that marked by Professor Greene. In the De Deorum Natura (1. 17), Cicero writes, Ut hic qui intervenit (me intuens) ne ignoret quae res agatur, de natura agebamus deorum. Professor Greene makes *deorum* emphatic. Why? He does not tell us. The speakers here are not discussing the ques-

tion of the existence or non-existence of gods, or taking the gods as a general subject of discussion, as one might take football, for instance. They are talking about their nature. Hence I should make *natura* rather than *deorum* emphatic, not explosively emphatic, but gently emphatic. The case is also interesting as an example of the rhythmical effect which the Roman sometimes gave to the end of a sentence by inserting an outside word between the two words of a phrase. It will be noticed that this does not injure the emphases. It should also be noticed that what we may call the natural utterance of the English expression, 'the nature of the gods', tends to befog the emphasis here through its propensity to stress the last word, while the possessive sign makes the plural, 'the gods' *nature*', very awkward. In the singular, 'God's *nature*', neither difficulty appears.

HENRY PREBLE

REVIEW

The Attica of Pausanias. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Plans and Excursuses, by Mitchell Carroll. Boston: Ginn & Co. (1908). Pp. vii + 293. Mailing Price, \$1.75.

Interest in archaeology has increased very widely in the last few years and now most college students of Greek get from their instructors some notion of Greece itself and its monuments. Hence it is a pleasure to know that Ginn and Co. have added to their College Series an edition of the first book of Pausanias, the Attica entire, dedicated appropriately to the late president of the Archaeological Institute, Professor Seymour. Pausanias is the archaeologist's Baedeker and the main interest in him is antiquarian, yet there is enough of the historical and mythological as well as of the archaeological to make his work more than a mere guide-book. The charm which characterizes the writings of Herodotus, who had much influence on Pausanias, is not altogether lacking and college students could easily read the Attica. It will do no harm to read a little second century Greek along with Herodotus and the other classical authors. In connection with such a course the instructor should lecture on the monuments and history of Athens and, where it is possible, use the stereopticon or photographs of the ancient monuments in Athens. This will be necessary because in Professor Carroll's edition there is a sad lack of plans, maps and photographic illustrations. There are only five figures, one of the Athenian Agora (p. 236), plans of the Theatre of Dionysus (p. 260), of the Propylaea (p. 272), of the foundations of the Parthenon (p. 277) and Dörpfeld's new plan of the Erechtheum and Old Temple of Athena (p. 281).

This edition appears very opportunely just after the

publication of Judeich's *Topographie von Athen* and Miss Harrison's *Primitive Athens*. As the edition is primarily archaeological, textual criticism is avoided and the recent text of Hitzig-Blümner adopted. The first eleven pages give a brief but excellent account of the scope and character of Pausanias's work, of its date, of Pausanias's life, of his aim and method, of his style, and finally of his use of previous writers. Professor Carroll rightly favors Gurlitt in opposition to Wilamowitz and Kalkmann and believes that Pausanias was not *omnium Graeculorum mendacissimus* but "withal an intelligent and inquisitive traveler who rambled through land and city and carefully noted what to him appeared worth seeing and recording. The extant monuments prove that his description of Athens is founded primarily on personal observation". Pages 12-25 present an elaborate topographical outline which will prove useful in following the route of Pausanias.

An unique feature of the notes (pp. 27-215) which accompany the text at the bottom of the page is that there is not one word of translation. The notes are taken mostly from Frazer's encyclopaedic work, Pausanias's *Description of Greece*, translated with commentary in six volumes. But sometimes the wrong references of Frazer are still uncorrected in Professor Carroll's edition. So the reference to Pliny N. H. XXXIII, 57 is wrong in both and should be XXXIV, 57 (cf. Frazer, op. cit. 2. 289 and Carroll, *Attica* p. 122). Moreover, little account is taken of the fifth volume of Frazer where pp. 473-543 give addenda to the *Attica*. For example, on page 168 it is said with regard to the larger temple at Rhamnus, "The lower portions of seven columns on the south side and one in the pronaos are still standing". Frazer, 2. 451, says the same with an *of* before one, which Professor Carroll has omitted. However the lower portions of only six columns on the south side remain and Frazer in 5. 531 has corrected his mistake. Again the note on the Cynosarges (p. 101) is taken from Frazer, 2. 193, and the Cynosarges is definitely located near the American School. But no reference is made to Dörpfeld's view, that it was south of the Ilissus, or to the excavations of Cecil Smith. And yet Frazer, Vol. 5. 493 ff., discusses these theories. If the inscription mentioning the Cynosarges, which I found, comes from the Cynosarges, then the theory of Dörpfeld (cf. A. M. 20, 1895, 507) or of Judeich (op. cit. 373) is very probable; cf. my remarks in A. J. P. 28 (1907), 425-428.

It was an excellent idea to relegate the discussion of the more involved topographical questions to twelve excursuses (pp. 228-289) and not to burden the notes with material which will not interest the beginner. The subjects, which are treated clearly and concisely, are the Harbors and Fortifications of Greater Athens, the Agora, the Enneacrurnus, the Theseum, Olypieum, Theatre of

Dionysus, Acropolis, Propylaea, Temple of Athena Nike, Parthenon, Erechtheum, the Old Athena Temple. In most cases Professor Carroll follows Dörpfeld. But he follows Leake in locating the site of Old Phalerum on the eastern slope of the hill of Munychia and thinks that "the so-called Third Long Wall of Athens, usually called the Phaleric Wall, has never existed except in the fancy of certain topographers". Gardner holds the same view but few other archaeologists care to return to Leake for their ideas of Athenian topography. Professor Carroll agrees with Dörpfeld that the so-called Theseum was the temple of Hephaestus, and that the Enneacrurnus was to the west of the acropolis, but believes that the Dionysium in Limnis is more probably identical with the precinct of the theater and not southwest of the Areopagus where Dörpfeld has certainly excavated some interesting buildings connected with the worship of Dionysus. With regard to the question of the Old Temple of Athena Professor Carroll says (p. 284): "In spite of the arguments of Dr. Dörpfeld and of Miss Harrison it seems certain that the Old Athena Temple did not exist in Pausanias's time". That is putting it strongly, for there are many who still join with Dörpfeld (cf. Dümmler in *Pauly-Wissowa* 2. 1954; Cooley, A. J. A. 1899, 355 ff.). Professor Carroll has evidently not learned that the conclusions of Wiegand and Schrader about the sculptures of the Old Temple of Athena (cf. excursus XII) have been overthrown by Dr. Heberdey's reconstitution in the second room of the museum on the acropolis. Furtwängler in *Sitzb. Mün. Akad.* 1905, 433 ff. proposed a different reconstruction from Wiegand's; to this also no reference is made. But that of Dr. Heberdey, wherein the center is occupied by a lioness tearing a bull and a large lion facing her and at each end is a serpent, is the best.

The appendix (pp. 216-227) treats of the manuscripts, editions, translations and commentaries, and gives an excellent select bibliography for the excursuses. Almost no important titles are missing. Weller's article on Thuc. 2. 15 in *Class. Rev.* 16 (1902), 158 ff. is cited neither by Professor Carroll nor by Miss Harrison in her book on Thuc. 2. 15. It would be better to refer to the last edition of Guides-Joanne, which was revised by Fougères in 1906, than to the edition of 1890.

Misprints are rare; cf. Hopletes for the tribe Hopletes on p. 51, Stevenson for Stevens (227, 282), Thuc. 1. 15 for Thuc. 2. 15, twice on p. 243, southwest for southeast (p. 250).

Professor Carroll's previous scholarly researches have enabled him to produce a book which will fill a long felt want and which will certainly prove helpful in interesting students in the artistic as well as in the literary aspects of Greek life and thought.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON